IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

IMPLICIT, LLC,	§
Plaintiff,	§
	§
V.	§
	§
IMPERVA, INC.	§ Case No. 2:19-cy-00040-JRG-RSP
	§ LEAD CASE
	§ LEAD CASE
FORTINET, INC.	\$ Case No. 2:19-cv-00039-JRG-RSP
	\$ Case No. 2.19-cv-00039-JRG-RSF
	§
JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.	§ C N 2.10 00027 IDC DCD
,	Case No. 2:19-cv-00037-JRG-RSP
	Š
SOPHOS LTD.	§ G N 240 00042 FG PGP
	S Case No. 2:19-cv-00042-JRG-RSP
Defendants.	Š Š
	V

JOINT MOTION FOR ENTRY OF DISPUTED DISCOVERY ORDER

Pursuant to the Court's Order dated July 1, 2019, Plaintiff Implicit, LLC and Defendants Imperva, Inc., Fortinet, Inc., Juniper Networks, Inc., and Sophos Ltd. (collectively, "Defendants") respectfully move for entry of a discovery order in this action. The parties agree to the attached proposed discovery order except for the following three provisions, which are in dispute:

- 1. In Paragraph 5(b), the number of requests for admission that may be served by each party other than common requests for admission and requests for admission not directed to establishing the authenticity of documents. Plaintiff proposes 10 requests for admission;

 Defendants propose 20 requests for admission.
 - a. **Plaintiff's Position**: Plaintiff does not believe it should be put in the position of fielding a combined 80 requests for admission, which will be unduly burdensome.

- b. Defendants' Position: Plaintiff would only need to respond to 20 requests for admission for each individual defendant, and Plaintiff will have an opportunity to submit the same number of requests for admission to each individual defendant. Although the Court consolidated the action, there are separate facts and issues to address during discovery for each individual defendant, and 20 requests for admission for each individual defendant is not an amount that is unduly burdensome.
- 2. In Paragraph 5(c)(3), the number of hours to be allotted for third party depositions.

 Plaintiff proposes that each Side be allotted 36 hours of third party deposition time and that Plaintiff will promptly produce the transcripts of depositions of third party witnesses taken in the currently-pending cases against NetScout Systems, Inc. and Sandvine Corporation to the extent Plaintiff can do so without violating the Protective Order entered in those cases; Defendants propose each Side be allotted 49 hours of third party deposition time.
 - a. **Plaintiff's Position**: Many of the third parties that defendants will likely wish to depose, *e.g.*, purported inventors of purported prior art, have already been deposed at least once (and some twice) in other cases. There is no need to burden the parties (and those third party witness) with further depositions on the exact same issues. Plaintiff therefore seeks to restrict the amount of third party deposition time allotted to each party to a reasonable amount.
 - b. **Defendants' Position**: Given Implicit's licensing, patent prosecution, and litigation history, Defendants may want or need to depose a variety of third parties, e.g., third-party licensees and component suppliers for the accused

products. Also, unlike Implicit, Defendants have not participated in the depositions of the third parties that Implicit claims to be concerned about, and some Defendants may choose to depose these third parties, even if Implicit produces the transcripts it is already obligated to produce. In light of the number of potential third party witnesses, Defendants' proposal of 49 hours of deposition time is reasonable.

- 3. In Paragraph 5(c)(7), the number of hours allocated for expert depositions of expert whose report addresses issues specific to more than one defendant. Plaintiff proposes 1 additional hour per Defendant; Defendants propose 3 additional hours per defendant.
 - a. **Plaintiff's Position**: Plaintiff's invalidity expert should not be subject to 7 hours plus 3 hours per defendant for a total of 19 hours on one expert report. That is excessive and beyond the needs of the case. A total of 11 hours ought to be sufficient.
 - b. **Defendants' Position**: Although the Court consolidated the action, these are still separate cases, so giving each individual defendant just 3 additional hours to depose an expert on issues specific to that defendant will not be excessive and beyond the needs of the case. Moreover, as defendants' proposed language shows, the defendants do not automatically get these additional hours, but only "if an expert report from plaintiff addresses issues specific to more than one defendant."

Dated: July 15, 2019

By: /s/Christopher L. Larson

Michael J. Sacksteder (CA Bar No. 191605) Jessica Lee Benzler (CA Bar No. 306164) Christopher L. Larson (CA Bar No. 308247)

FENWICK & WEST LLP-San Francisco

555 California Street

12th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94104

415/875-2300

Facsimile: (415) 281-1350

Email: msacksteder@fenwick.com;

jbenzler@fenwick.com; clarson @fenwick.com

GEOFFREY ROBERT MILLER (TX State Bar No. 24094847)

FENWICK & WEST LLP-Mtn. View

Silicon Valley Center 801 California Street Mountain View, CA 94041 650-988-8500

Facsimile: (650) 938-5200

gmiller@fenwick.com

Counsel for Defendant Imperva, Inc.

By: /s/Alice E. Snedeker

Deron R. Dacus

State Bar No. 00790553

THE DACUS FIRM, P.C. 821 ESE Loop 323, Suite 430

Tyler, TX 75701

Phone: (903) 705-1117 Fax: (903) 581-2543 ddacus@dacusfirm.com

Matthew C. Gaudet (GA SBN 287789)

Admitted E.D. Tex.

David C. Dotson (GA SBN 138040)

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/Brandon C. Martin

Spencer Hosie, pro hac vice,

(CA Bar No. 101777) shosie@hosielaw.com

Diane S. Rice, pro hac vice,

(CA Bar No. 118303) drice@hosielaw.com

Brandon C. Martin, pro hac vice,

(CA Bar No. 269624) bmartin@hosielaw.com

Darrell Rae Atkinson, pro hac vice,

(CA Bar No. 280564) datkinson@hosielaw.com

Francesca M.S. Germinario, pro hac vice,

(CA Bar No. 326208) fgerminario@hosielaw.com

HOSIE RICE LLP

600 Montgomery St., 34th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111

415.247.6000 Fax: 415.247.6001

William E. Davis, III (TX Bar No. 24047416)

bdavis@bdavisfirm.com

Christian J. Hurt (TX Bar No. 24059987)

churt@bdavisfirm.com Edward Chin (Of Counsel) (TX Bar No. 50511688) echine@bdavisfirm.com Debra Coleman (Of Counsel) (TX Bar No. 24059595) dcoleman@bdavisfirm.com THE DAVIS FIRM, PC

213 N. Fredonia Street, Suite 230

Longview, Texas 75601 Telephone: (903) 230-9090 Facsimile: (903) 230-9661

Counsel for Plaintiff Implicit, LLC

Admitted E.D. Tex.

John R. Gibson (GA SBN 454507)

Admitted E.D. Tex.

Alice E. Snedeker

Admitted E.D. Tex.

DUANE MORRIS LLP

1075 Peachtree NE, Suite 2000

Atlanta, GA 30309

Telephone: 404.253.6900 Facsimile: 404.253.6901

Email: mcgaudet@duanemorris.com;

dcdotson@duanemorris.com; jrgibson@duanemorris.com aesnedeker@duanemorris.com

Christopher J. Tyson (VA SBN 81553)

Admitted E.D. Tex.

DUANE MORRIS LLP

505 9th Street, N.W., Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20004-2166

Tel: 202.776.7800 Fax: 202.776.7801

Email: cjtyson@duanemorris.com

Counsel for Defendant Fortinet, Inc.

By: /s/Ingrid Marie Haslund Peterson

IRELL & MANELLA LLP-Newport

Beach

David McPhie

(CA Bar No. 231520) [Pro Hac Vice]

Ingrid Marie Haslund Peterson

(CA Bar No. 313927) [Pro Hac Vice]

840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400

Newport Beach, CA 92660 Telephone: (949) 760-0991 Facsimile: (949) 760-5200

Email: dmcphie@irell.com;

ipeterson@irell.com

IRELL & MANELLA LLP-Los Angeles

Jonathan S. Kagan (CA Bar No. 166039) [Pro Hac Vice] 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900 Los Angeles, CA 90067-4276

Telephone: (310) 277-1010 Facsimile: (310) 203-7199 Email: jkagan@irell.com

GILLAM & SMITH LLP

Melissa R. Smith (Texas Bar No. 24001351) 303 South Washington Avenue Marshall, TX 75670

Telephone: (903) 934-8450 Facsimile: (903) 934-9257

Email: melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Juniper Networks, Inc.

By: /s/Sarah J. Fischer

Douglas J. Kline (BBO #556680) Robert Frederickson (BBO #670111) Sarah J. Fischer (BBO #688878)

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

100 Northern Avenue Boston, MA 02210 Tel.: 617-570-1000 Fax: 617-523-1231 dkline@goodwinlaw.com

rfrederickson@goodwinlaw.com sfischer@goodwinlaw.com

Jennifer P. Ainsworth (Texas Bar Card #00784720)

WILSON, ROBERTSON & CORNELIUS, P.C.

909 ESE Loop 323, Suite 400

Tyler, Texas 75701 Tel.: 903-509-5000 Fax: 903-509-5092

Email: jainsworth@wilsonlawfirm.com

Attorneys for Sophos Ltd.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document is being filed electronically in

compliance with Local Rule CV-5(a). As such, this document is being served on all counsel who

are deemed to have consented to electronic service. Local Rule CV-5(a)(3)(V). Pursuant to

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(d) and Local Rule CV-5(d) and (e), any counsel of record not

deemed to have consented to electronic service will be served with a true and correct copy of the

foregoing by email on this 15th day of July 2019.

/s/ Brandon C. Martin

Brandon C. Martin

- 7 -